## REMARKS

In the Office Action, the examiner objected to the drawings on the ground that Figures 1A-1H and 2A-2C lack a prior art legend and Figure 2B includes a typographical error. Accordingly, the applicant has submitted concurrently herewith a request for approval of drawing changes in which a "Prior Art" label is added to Figures 1A-1H and 2A-2C and the typographical error in Figure 2B is corrected. The replacement sheet of the amended drawings are also submitted concurrently herewith.

The examiner rejected Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-10, 12-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Chenault et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,640,187). The examiner rejected Claims 3, 8, 11 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Chenault et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,640,187) in view of Esposito (U.S. Patent No. 6,101,496). Accordingly, the applicant has amended the claims to more clearly differentiate the present invention from the technologies disclosed by the cited references.

In the present invention, the navigation system learns the relationship between assumed location of the address number given in the map data and an actual position of the destination which is informed by arrival detection and updates the address data. The navigation system stores the updated address data regarding the relationship between the street address number and the actual position for use in the next travel. Thus, when a new destination on the same street is specified, the navigation system is able to

determined the position of the destination more accurately. As amended in Claims 1 and 9, all of the foregoing processes or functions are conducted by a single navigation system.

The cited Chenault et al. reference discloses a method and system for collecting address and location data for a geographic database. Data are collected using a plurality of end users' navigation systems. The data indicate a location at which a trip by a vehicle in which a navigation system is located ended and a desired destination entered into the navigation system by an end user prior thereto. These data are received in a data collection facility that statistically analyzes the data and uses the data to update a geographic database.

As noted above, the method of the present invention is performed by a single navigation system. In contrast, the method of the cited Chenault et al. reference is performed by a plurality of navigation systems and the central data collection facility. The data collection facility collects the address data from the plurality of navigation systems and statistically analyzes the collected data to update the map database. By definition, the statistical analysis requires data from two or more navigation systems to obtain the statistically refined geographical data. Regarding the statistical analysis, the descriptions at column 9, lines 6-11 of Chenault et al. reads as follows:

The central facility 500 processes the data using statistical analysis techniques (Step 520). The statistical analysis techniques are used to find relationships between the locations at which vehicles

were shut off and the associated addresses that had been entered as destinations before the <u>vehicles</u> had been shut off. (underline added)

The above extract shows that to apply the statistical analysis techniques, large amount of data from two or more vehicles (navigation systems) must be used. In the present invention, however, only one navigation system can achieve the purpose of the invention with use of one piece of data. Therefore, there is a significant difference between the method of the present invention and the method of the cited Chenault et al. reference. Since the essential feature of the present invention is not shown by the cited reference, the applicant believes that the rejection of Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-10, 12-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is no longer applicable to the present invention.

The cited Esposito reference discloses a method of assigning x and y coordinates (geocoding) to data containing location information. As stated by the examiner with respect to Claims 3 and 8, the cited Esposito reference teaches allocating new address numbers by interpolating two known address numbers. In Esposito, the new address numbers are created by interpolating the two known address numbers because the traditional data sources may not have address number between the two known address numbers. In the present invention, however, the interpolation is used to correct the position of the address numbers that already exist. Thus, there is a significant difference between the present invention and the method of the cited Esposito reference.

Nevertheless, the present invention defined in Claims 1 and 9 is fully differentiated from the cited Chenault et al. reference as discussed above, and Claims 3, 8, 11 and 16 are dependent upon independent Claims 1 and 9 and specify the present invention with further specificities. Thus, the applicant believes that the rejection of 3, 8, 11 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is no longer applicable to the present invention.

In this opportunity, Applicant has amended the specification to correct the minor errors therein and to more clearly disclose the present invention. This is to verify that no new matter has been introduced by this amendment.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes that Claims 1-16 are in condition for allowance, and accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the present application be allowed and passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,
MURAMATSU & ASSOCIATES

Dated: 10/12/04

Vasuo Muramatsu

Registration No. 38,684

Attorney of Record

7700 Irvine Center Drive Suite 225, Irvine, CA 92618

(949) 753-1127

AMD-AP34.001 101204

## IN THE DRAWINGS:

The applicant has submitted concurrently herewith a request for approval of drawing changes in which a "Prior Art" label is added to Figures 1A-1H and 2A-2C and the typographical error in Figure 2B is corrected. The replacement sheets of the amended drawings are also submitted concurrently herewith.









